

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 11 2006

**DILLON & YUDELL LLP**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

## USPTO FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner Christopher Brown	James E. Boice, Reg. No. 44,545
ORGANIZATION:	DATE:
US Patent and Trademark Office	January 11, 2006
ART UNIT:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
2134	4
FAX NUMBER:	APPLICATION SERIAL NO:
571.273.8300	10/062,348
571.273.3833	
ENCLOSED:	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO:
Proposed agenda;	AUS920010978US1
PTOL 413A	

☒ URGENT ☐ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

This fax from the law firm of Dillon & Yudell LLP contains information that is confidential or privileged, or both. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named on this fax cover letter. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by any person other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us by telephone immediately at 512.343.6116 so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the transmitted documents at no cost to you.

8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110, AUSTIN, TEXAS 78759  
512.343.6116 (V) • 512.343.6446 (F) • DILLONYUDELL.COM

JAN 11 2006

PTOL-413A (09-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0691-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/062,348 First Named Applicant: David Yu Chang  
 Examiner: Christopher J. Brown Art Unit: 2134 Status of Application: Final

Tentative Participants:  
 (1) Jlm Boice, Attorney for Applicants (2) Christopher Brown, Examiner  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: January 18, 2006 Proposed Time: 10:00 EST (AM/PM)  
 Type of Interview Requested:  
 (1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference  
 Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO  
 If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejection</u>	<u>1, et al.</u>	<u>Wrench, Sasaki, Schne</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[ ] Continuation Sheet Attached					

## Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See attached sheet.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

  
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner/SPB Signature

James E. Boice

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

44,545

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Application No. 10/062,348  
Interview agenda  
Wednesday, January 18, 2006  
10:00 EST

All issues relate to exemplary Claim 1:

1. "data storage that is accessible only to a client computer."

This feature is rejected under 112. However, this feature is supported, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 21-26, since the user must enter a password to access the data storage via a GUI on "display 32 using GUI application 40, shown in Figures 3 and 4, respectively, for the user's password 22 that will unlock that user's keyfile 24 containing the user's digital certificate and private key found in authentication data 42 as described in Figure 4." That is, only a local input that is physically input at the client computer will be accepted by the client computer, and thus the data storage is accessible only to the client computer.

*Sasaki* teaches in Figure 3, and col 5, lines 40-45, that the CPU in the client computer is to "determine whether the input user ID and password accords with a registered user ID and password." However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the limitation that the data storage is accessible only to the client computer.

Thus, this feature is supported by the specification, and does not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited art.

2. "each of said passwords being capable of opening only one of said keyfiles"

This feature is also rejected under 112. However, this feature is supported, *inter alia*, on page 12 line 8, in which "Each of the multiple users has a unique keyfile 24." As stated on page 10, lines 10-12, the "user identified by user identifier 15a ("User ID 1") enters password 22a ("Password1") to open keyfile 24a ("Keyfile 1").

Thus each of the passwords is "capable of opening only one of said keyfiles," such that "in response to receiving one of said passwords input from the specific user, opening said one of said keyfiles associated with said one of said passwords and said specific user."

Thus, this feature is supported by the specification, and is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

3. "storing a plurality of keyfiles for different users" and "in response to receiving one of said passwords input from the specific user, opening said one of said keyfiles associated with said one of said passwords and said specific user" (i.e., each of the keyfiles are password protected for a specific user).

This feature is supported, *inter alia*, by Figure 4 and the related text.

While *Wrench* teaches that a private key may be password protected (paragraph [0028]), there is no suggestion of storing a different keyfile for each of a plurality of different users. Similarly, while *Sasaki* teaches that a password and ID checker (user authentication unit 2) may check to see if a password and ID are correct for opening a file, there is no suggestion of multiple "users" having different "keyfiles."

Thus, this feature is not taught or suggested by the cited art.